

It is an unprecedented move for the Sinclair group to provide 90 minutes of free political advertising, or should we actually say a smear campaign, for the benefit of their candidate, without an equal amount of time being given to the candidate being smeared. John Kerry should have an opportunity to respond to these unproven attacks, and not in the "panel discussion" which will simply turn into an attack forum. It is an impossible situation for Kerry, and inherently unfair. The FCC is supposed to uphold standards of fairness for those who use the public airways (as opposed to cable or pay-per-view programs), and the Sinclair group is airing a skewed "documentary" of questionable accuracy in a direct attempt to influence an election. Is this a return to colonial times, when anyone with a printing press could spawn any filth and lies, to try to destroy not only a candidate's chance for election, but to destroy his character? The FCC must act to prevent this miscarriage of justice.

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard.
Thank you,

Dr. Gregory Alberts